



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Judged by the best standards, Gen. Adams himself had none of the qualities of inspiration and enthusiasm, or the instinct of a real soldier. It seems apparent that the duties of the march, camp, and bivouac were distasteful to him, and that his blood did not rush quickly, his heart did not throb at the thought of meeting the foe on the battlefield. He certainly showed a lack of energy when his regiment was being reduced by sickness on account of the unhealthy location of his camps, yet he made no effort to get a change of location. Surely, the son of Charles Francis Adams, the skilful and loyal Minister to the Court of St. James, could have obtained the necessary permission for a change of the location of his camp, simply for the asking.

When his regiment did leave the unhealthy camp, he obtained the necessary permission (and horses) to mount his men for scout duty, a service which requires intelligence, energy, active minds, coolness and courage, traits which the colored soldiers possessed in only a limited degree.

His regiment proved a failure, and Adams retired from the service.

I would not attempt to criticise his action during the years that followed his military career: his service as a lawyer, and especially as the head manager of the Union Pacific Railroad—which he evidently considered the greatest work of his life; but, as a soldier, I would express my admiration of the moral courage he displayed, the words of justice he spoke, in his admirable eulogy of Gen. Robert E. Lee before the Virginians at their University.

This great soldier, who was equaled only by Gen. McClellan (and possibly by George H. Thomas), among the noted Union Generals of the Civil War, for military skill, for a pure and temperate life, honesty and generous action, was well worthy of the words of praise and respect awarded him by Gen. Adams.

We may blame Gen. Lee for his disloyalty to his country, but, at the same time, the atmosphere in which he had lived, which constantly asserted the principle of "State rights," teaching him that his first duty was loyalty to his State rather than to his country, should be considered in passing judgment on his action at the beginning of the Civil War.

It would be folly to deny that if many of the soldiers who fought for the Union had been born and raised at the South and educated in Southern ideas amid Southern environment, they would have fought for the Southern Confederacy instead of in the armies of the Union.

If Gen. Adams leaves no other memories to perpetuate his name in the future, he will be honored and revered in the South for the brave and generous words he uttered in his notable address on the life and character of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

LUTHER STEPHENSON,
Brevet Brig. Gen'l, U. S. Volunteers.

HINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS.

TRAITORS

SIR,—In your editorial in the September NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW upon the execution of Sir Roger Casement as a traitor to the British Government you show that no analogy existed between Casement and General Washington.

You do this in a few lucid sentences, giving simply the bare facts, in substance as follows:

Washington represented a fully organized government, capable of exercising, and which did in fact exercise, the functions of government, both in authority and responsibility.

This fact placed the Colonies in the category of sovereign belligerents, even though they were in one sense Revolutionists.

The British ministry so interpreted the situation, for it sent Howe to negotiate with Washington, and subsequently expressed a readiness to engage in further negotiations.

Those American patriots who fell into its hands were not treated as traitors or punished as such by it, but both private soldiers and high officers were regarded as legitimate prisoners of war and so treated.

I entirely agree with you, for none of these facts could be urged in behalf of Roger Casement. He had accepted profitable employment for long years from the British Government, also Knighthood and other honors from the King. He properly met a traitor's doom—terrible, yet just.

So far so good. But why spoil an admirable article by one unhappy sentence in your closing paragraph?

These are your words: "Our own nation dealt with treason and with traitors in 1861-65 very differently from the way it dealt with them in 1776-83."

With what treason and with what traitors in 1861-65? Was not the Confederate States a fully organized Government, firmly established? Was it not capable of exercising, and did it not exercise, the functions of government both in authority and in responsibility? Were they not sovereign belligerents, so recognized by the nations of the world, including the United States itself? Were not Confederate prisoners, both military and civilian, treated as legitimate prisoners of war? Indeed, do you not recall that instead of sending Mr. Seward or even General Grant to the memorable peace conference in Hampton Roads, Mr. Lincoln went in person to negotiate with the Vice-President of the Confederate States and his colleagues? True, Mr. Lincoln carried Seward with him, but only as an adviser.

Do you realize that "treason and traitors" are ugly words to apply to some millions of brave, generous and patriotic men? Is not treason infamous? Is not "traitor" the extremest term of infamy?

Can it be that more than fifty years after Appomatox, Colonel George Harvey, editor of the one great journal published in America, who has a very host of sincere admirers in the South, deliberately characterizes our people in terms which if true should bar us from the homes of all honorable men in all the world? If our fathers were traitors, then not even your pardon, "so creditable to you in sentiment," can wipe out the stain. We did not expect such words from you whom so many of us both respect and esteem. Did you really mean it, Colonel Harvey?

A. L. MILLER.

MACON, GEORGIA.

[No, we certainly did not mean any such thing, but quite the contrary. Perhaps our meaning would have been clearer if we had spoken of the way in which this nation dealt with *the subject* of treason and traitors, instead of "with treason and with traitors." Our meaning was that things

which were regarded as treason and men who were regarded as traitors in the Revolution were not thus regarded in the Civil War; or, however they may have been regarded by some in the passion of conflict, they were never practically dealt with as such. In all that struggle, we believe, only one man was ever made to suffer the penalty of treason, and that was done by an officer whose conduct has been criticised by the North as severely as by the South. How such matters were regarded in Revolutionary times may be judged from the fact that Virginia and Pennsylvania in 1785 enacted laws making it treason to attempt to erect a new state in any part of their territory without the consent of the legislature. If this nation had been animated by the same spirit in 1861-65, it might have regarded as traitors all who strove—as of course the South did—to erect a new state within its territory. Instead, it regarded the seceding Confederates as belligerents, entitled to the same treatment that would have been given to some entirely separate nation which for some cause had waged war against us.—EDITOR.]

THE NICARAGUA ROUTE

SIR,—In the September issue of your REVIEW, under "Letters to the Editor," I have read with interest the communication of Mr. Joseph Ferguson, of Philadelphia, and your reply, relative to "The Nicaragua Route." I am especially interested in the Nicaraguan Canal possibilities, having, in years gone by, had relatives more or less intimately associated with the Nicaraguan Government in fostering this route for our canal.

Could you direct me to any records, here or in Nicaragua, wherein I might find the extent of negotiations achieved during the Presidency of Zelaya and the names of some, if not all, of the parties who advocated this route during the ten years (1893 to 1903) referred to in your reply to the above mentioned letter? Frequently, I have made several attempts to get statistics anent this matter, and not until THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW have in sight did I feel that any of the attempts would be successful.

May I express to you my keen appreciation of the literary excellence of the REVIEW, which I read with genuine delight and anticipate with wonderment and interest?

With cordial and hearty wishes for the Editor and THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,

JAS. R. GARBER.

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA.

[The Nicaragua Maritime Canal Company of 1889 was under the presidency of Hiram Hitchcock, of New York; and its actual work was done by a Construction Company, under the presidency of Senator Warner Miller, of New York. The whole venture failed in 1893. Senator Morgan, of Alabama, conducted for years thereafter a campaign for Government aid for the rehabilitation of the enterprise, but did not succeed. In 1898 a rival organization was formed to take over from Nicaragua a renewal of the concession which was about to lapse. This was known as the Grace-Eyre-Cragin Syndicate, and included among its members William R. Grace, John D. Crimmins, John Jacob Astor, Levi P. Morton, Darius O. Mills, and other New York capitalists. The State Department interceded in behalf